



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,034	05/30/2006	Hiromu Ohnogi	1422-0716PUS1	5993
2292 7590 09/21/2007 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			EXAMINER SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A	
			ART UNIT 1625	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/581,034

Applicant(s)

OHNOGI ET AL.

Examiner

Taofiq A. Solola

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims lack adequate support in the specification. The term "derivative" is not defined in the specification so as to ascertain the structures of the compounds that are included and/or excluded by the term. In patent examination, it is essential for claims to be precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989). By deleting the term the rejection would be overcome.

Claims 2-7 are drawn to mechanisms: treating or preventing diseases that are sensitive to the compounds, diseases that require suppression of nitrogen monoxidase or inhibition of aldose reductase. These are not practical utilities under the US patent practice. To ascertain the practical utilities, one must read the specification into the claims contrary to several precedent decisions by the US courts and Official practice. The claims are attempts by applicant to claim treatment or prevention of all diseases known today and that may be discovered in the future, arising from the mechanisms. They are reach-through claims and are no longer patentable under the US patent practice. A claim must stand alone to define the invention, and incorporation into the claims by reference to the specification or an external

Art Unit: 1625

source is not permitted. Ex parte Fressola, 27 USPQ 2d 1608, BdPatApp & Inter. (1993). By deleting the claims the rejection would be overcome.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for the claimed mechanism. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

"In the context of determining whether sufficient "utility as a drug, medicant, and the like in human therapy" has been alleged, It is proper for the examiner to ask for substantiating evidence unless one with ordinary skill in the art would accept the [compounds and the utilities] as obviously correct." *In re Jolles*, 628 F.2d 1327, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1980), citing *In re Novak*, 306 F.2d 924 (CCPA 1962); see 340 F.2d 974, 977-78 (CCPA 1965).

"A specification disclosure which contains a teaching of the manner and process of making and using the invention . . . must be taken as in compliance with the enabling requirement of the first paragraph of § 112 unless there is reason to doubt the objective truth of the statements contained therein which must be relied on for enabling support." *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995), *Id.* at 1566, quoting *Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 223 (CCPA 1971); *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171-72 (Fed. Cir. 1993), quoting *Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d at 223; see also *Armbruster*, 512 F.2d 676, 677 (CCPA 1975); *Knowlton*, 500 F.2d 566, 571 (CCPA 1974); *Bowen*, 492 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1974); *Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 576 (CCPA 1973).

Where there is "no indication that one skilled in the art would accept without question [the instant compounds and method of use] and no evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the claimed products do have those effects *Novak*, 306 F.2d at 928, an applicant has failed to sufficiently demonstrate sufficient utility and therefore cannot establish

Art Unit: 1625

enablement.” *In re Rasmusson*, 75 USPQ2d 1297 (CAFC 2005). The claimed invention is not enabled without undue experimentation for the following reasons:

For rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the following factors must be considered. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC, 1988): “The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as a) the breadth of the claims, b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, c) the presence or absence of working examples, d) the nature of the invention, e) the state of the prior art, f) the relative skill of those in that art, g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, h) and, the quantity of experimentation necessary, *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. The breadth of the claims includes compounds 1-9. The nature of the invention is using the compounds as pharmaceuticals, in food, beverage or animal feeds. There is no known prior art that broadly teaches applicability of the compounds for treating or preventing diseases that are sensitive to them, diseases that require suppression of nitrogen monoxidase or inhibition of aldose reductase. For example, see Dimmock et al., *Current Med. Chem.* (1999), Vol. 6(12), pp. 1125-1149.

It is quite possible that mutations in the genes for the proteins responsible for nitrogen monoxidase and/or aldose reductase may lead to increase level. To use the invention as claimed, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to perform experimentation in every instance to determine if the increase is due to genetic mutation in a patient or not. After prospective patients are identified and treated, assays must be performed on each one to determine if treatment is successful. However, the specification fails to disclose a routine procedure to perform such assay. Therefore, to make and use the instant invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to perform significant amount of experimentation. Such is deemed undue experiment under the US patent practice.

Art Unit: 1625

The specification fails to disclose how prospective patients whose nitrogen monoxidase and/or aldose reductase would require inhibition could be identified and preventive measures taken before the onset of increase nitrogen monoxidase and/or aldose reductase. There are no assays in the specification to determine increased levels of nitrogen monoxidase or aldose reductase and what normal and abnormal levels are.

Even then, the diseases cited on pages 12-13 of the specification, as arising from increased nitrogen monoxidase and/or aldose reductase are mere speculations. There is no conclusive evidence in the specification that established nexus between the diseases and nitrogen monoxidase or aldose reductase.

There is no disclosure on how to make the derivatives. Therefore, to make and use the instant invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to perform significant amount of experimentation by trial and error. She must start from the beginning to the end of textbooks in organic chemistry to determine if any structurally close compound is in fact a derivative. If the compounds are made there is no conclusive evidence in the specification they would have the asserted utilities. Such is deemed undue experiment under the US patent practice.

There is no absolute predictability or established correlation between the claims and the specification disclosures. The uncertainty presents one of ordinary skill in the art with obstacles and prevents her from accepting the invention on its face. Predictability in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. See *Ex parte Mass*, 9 USPQ2d 1746, (1987).

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "[a] conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding any of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27

Art Unit: 1625

USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. By deleting the claims the rejection would be overcome.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For the reasons set forth above under 35 USC 112, first paragraph the claims are indefinite. See the Examiner's suggestions above.

The term "derivative" is not defined in the claims so as to ascertain the structures of the compounds that are included and/or excluded by the term. Therefore, it is not possible to ascertain the metes and bounds of the claims.

Claims 3-4 improperly depend from claim 2 for failure to limit the scope of claim 2. Claims 6-7 also improperly depend from claim 5 for the same reason. The claims are drawn to agent (composition) or food, beverage and feed comprising the same compounds. The dependent claims cite intended uses. Under the US patent practice intended use is not a limitation of a compound or product. *In re Hack*, 114USPQ 161 (CCPA, 1957); *In re Craig*, 90 USPQ 33 (CCPA, 1951); *In re Brenner*, 82 USPQ 49 (CCPA, 1949). By deleting claims 3-4, 6-7, the rejection would be overcome.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1625

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dimmock et al.,  
Current Med. Chem. (1999), Vol. 6(12), pp. 1125-1149.

Dimmock et al., disclose compounds 2-10, 13-14, 16-20, etc., which are deemed  
derivatives of compounds of claim 1, absent a showing to the contrary.

### ***Specification***

The title does not sufficiently relate to the invention and fails to inform one of ordinary  
skill in the art the subject matter of the invention. See the MPEP.

### ***Telephone Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner  
should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709.  
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,  
Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is  
(571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding  
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.



**TAOFIQ SOLOLA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Group 1625

September 15, 2007